



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,244	03/22/2004	Noboru Yonekawa	204552032600	9051

7590 08/03/2006

Barry E. Bretschneider
Morrison & Foerster LLP
Suite 300
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER

REIS, TRAVIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2859

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/805,244	Applicant(s) YONEKAWA, NOBORU	
	Examiner Travis M. Reis	Art Unit 2859	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, & 12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 6, & 7 of copending Application No. 10/805221. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations claimed in claims 1, 6, 7, & 10-12 of this application are present in claims 1, 2, 6, & 7 of Application No. 10/805221.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, & 12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 6, & 8-10 of copending Application No. 10/805228. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations claimed in claims 1, 6, 7, 11, & 12 of this application are present in claims 1, 2, 4, 6, & 8-10 of Application No. 10/805228.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 1-8 & 10-12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 10-12, & 15 of copending Application No. 10/805250. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations claimed in claims 1-4, 6-8, 11, & 12 of this application are present in claims 1, 2, 10-12, & 15 of Application No. 10/805250.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. Claim 9 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 & 6 of copending Application No. 10/805221 in view of Hirano. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 9 claims a device as stated in claims 1 & 6 of copending Application No. 10/805228. with the exception of a mold release layer.

Hirano discloses a roller for fixation with a mold release layer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the device claimed in claims 1 & 6 of copending Application No. 10/805221 with the mold release layer as taught by Hirano in order to prevent wear.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. Claim 9 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, & 9 of copending Application No. 10/805228 in view of Hirano. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 9 claims a device as stated in claims 1, 6, & 9 of

compending Application No. 10/805228. with the exception of a mold release layer.

Hirano discloses a roller for fixation with a mold release layer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the device claimed in claims 1, 6, & 9 of compending Application No. 10/805228 with the mold release layer as taught by Hirano in order to prevent wear.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. Claim 9 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 & 11 of compending Application No. 10/805250 in view of Hirano. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 9 claims a device as stated in claims 1 & 11 of compending Application No. 10/805250 with the exception of a mold release layer.

Hirano discloses a roller for fixation with a mold release layer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the device claimed in claims 1 & 11 of compending Application No. 10/805228 with the mold release layer as taught by Hirano in order to prevent wear.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's Remarks, filed 5/24/6, with respect to claim 1 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The prior art rejection of claims 1-12 has been withdrawn.

In response to applicant's arguments that a terminal disclaimer only when one of the provisional applications is issued and hence is not needed now; these arguments have been

Art Unit: 2859

fully considered but they are not persuasive since Application No. 10/805250 has been allowed. Hence, a Terminal Disclaimer is now required to overcome the Double Patenting Rejection. See MPEP § 1490.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Travis M. Reis whose telephone number is (571) 272-2249. The examiner can normally be reached on 8--5 M--F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272-2245. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2859

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Travis M Reis
Examiner
Art Unit 2859



Diego Gutierrez
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Tech Center 2800

tmr
July 31, 2006